

1 KEKER & VAN NEST, LLP
JOHN W. KEKER - #49092
2 HENRY C. BUNSOW - #60707
MICHAEL H. PAGE - #154913
3 710 Sansome Street
San Francisco, CA 94111-1704
4 Telephone: (415) 391-5400
Facsimile: (415) 397-7188

5 INTERTRUST TECHNOLOGIES CORPORATION
6 DOUGLAS K. DERWIN - #111407
MARK SCADINA - #173103
7 JEFF MCDOW - #184727
4800 Patrick Henry Drive
8 Santa Clara, CA 95054
Telephone: (408) 855-0100
9 Facsimile: (408) 855-0144

10 Attorneys for Plaintiff and Counter-Defendant
INTERTRUST TECHNOLOGIES CORPORATION

11
12 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
13 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
14

15 INTERTRUST TECHNOLOGIES
CORPORATION, a Delaware corporation,

16 Plaintiff,

17 v.

18 MICROSOFT CORPORATION, a
19 Washington corporation,

20 Defendant.

21 AND COUNTER ACTION.
22

Case No. C 01-1640 SBA (MEJ)

Consolidated with C 02-0647 SBA

**NOTICE OF APPLICATION AND
APPLICATION FOR LEAVE TO AMEND
COMPLAINT AND LOCAL RULE 3-1
DISCLOSURES; REQUEST FOR
FURTHER CASE MANAGEMENT
CONFERENCE**

Judge: The Honorable Saundra B. Armstrong

Date: October 22, 2002

Time: 1:00 p.m.

23
24 **NOTICE OF APPLICATION**

25 PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that plaintiff and counter-defendant InterTrust Technologies
26 Corporation ("InterTrust") hereby applies, pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 15(a), for
27 leave to amend it Complaint in this action. InterTrust further applies, pursuant to Patent Local
28 Rule 3-7, for leave to serve an amended Patent Local Rule 3-1 Disclosure of Asserted Claims

1 and Preliminary Infringement Contentions. InterTrust also requests that the Court schedule a
2 further Case Management Conference at its earliest convenience. This application is set for
3 hearing on October 22, 2002, at 1:00 p.m. This application is based upon the following
4 Memorandum of Points and Authorities, and upon the accompanying declarations of Michael H.
5 Page and David P. Maher.

6 MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

7 I. INTRODUCTION

8 InterTrust hereby applies for leave to amend its complaint, in the form attached hereto as
9 Exhibit A, and to serve amended Patent Local Rule 3-1 disclosures, in order to include in this
10 case significant additional infringements of its patents by Defendant Microsoft Corporation
11 ("Microsoft"). Those additional infringements include Microsoft products and services
12 introduced to the marketplace since the filing of InterTrust's initial complaint in this action, as
13 well as infringements revealed as a result of discovery produced by Microsoft in the course of
14 this litigation. If granted, leave to amend will add an additional four InterTrust patents (Nos.
15 5,915,019 ("the '019 patent"), 5,949,876 ("the '876 patent"), 6,112,181 ("the '181 patent") and
16 6,389,402 B1 ("the '402 patent")) to the seven patents already in suit.

17 Leave to amend should be granted, as a matter of course, for numerous reasons:

- 18 • Although the proposed amendment adds additional patents, the patents are closely
19 related to those already in suit; all but one is a continuation or continuation-in-part
20 from the same parent application as the current patents-in-suit, sharing
21 substantially the same specification.
- 22 • The additional patents do not add any inventors to the suit, and Microsoft has not
23 yet deposited any of the inventors.
- 24 • All documents related to the invention and reduction to practice of the four
25 additional patents have already been produced in response to previous Microsoft
26 discovery requests, and thus no additional discovery from InterTrust will be
27 required.
- 28 • In advance of this motion and contemporaneous with claim charts for the existing
patents-in-suit, InterTrust provided Microsoft with complete draft claim charts for
the four additional patents (claim charts that under the Patent Local Rules would
not have been due for months after filing), thus obviating any delay caused by
amendment.
- In the absence of leave to amend, InterTrust would be required (and entitled) to
file the new allegations of infringement as a separate case, which in due course

either (a) would be related to and consolidated with the existing suit anyway, after unnecessary delay and motion practice, or (b) would proceed separately, requiring two Markman hearings construing multiple identical terms and two trials, both raising the distinct possibility of conflicting rulings.

Basic principles of judicial economy and established rules of procedure dictate that leave to amend be granted in such circumstances. InterTrust, in advance of filing this application, served upon Microsoft amended claim charts for the existing patents-in-suit and complete claim charts for the four additional patents, and asked that Microsoft stipulate to leave to amend. See Declaration of Michael H. Page (“Page Decl.”), ¶¶ 5-9 & Exhs.C,D. Microsoft declined to stipulate, necessitating this application.¹ Id., ¶ 6-9 & Exhs. E, G.

II. STATEMENT OF FACTS

This action has been pending for some fifteen months. As one would expect in any litigation concerning "cutting edge" technology, the world has not stood still while this case has been pending. Microsoft has continued to release new versions of its software, and has unveiled numerous new products, services, and initiatives. Chief among those initiatives has been Microsoft's ".NET" initiative, Microsoft's next generation technology platform. Since this lawsuit was filed, Microsoft has rolled out myriad aspects of .NET, and has begun publishing sufficient information about its .NET architecture to enable InterTrust to identify numerous additional infringements of its patents. As set forth in the accompanying Declaration of David P. Maher, InterTrust's Chief Technical Officer (hereafter, "Maher Decl."), significant technical source material used to identify those infringements was not available until late 2001 or 2002. Maher Decl., ¶5.

In addition, since this lawsuit was filed, Microsoft has shipped new versions of its operating system (Windows XP), has unveiled the Xbox gaming system, has introduced or updated technologies such as Windows CE for Automotive, Microsoft's driver signing

¹ In addition to adding four new patents, InterTrust's proposed amended complaint includes U.S. Patent No. 6,157,721, which is currently asserted in a separate but related and consolidated action, No. C 02 0647 SBA. The amended complaint makes no changes in the allegations related to that patent, and incorporates it only in order to fully consolidate the pending actions under a single case number. Upon filing of the Fourth Amended Complaint, the consolidated case could then be dismissed as moot.

1 technology, and its Media Player application, and has implemented numerous new technologies
2 to allow secure computing across multiple distributed machines. Maher Decl. ¶¶ 6, 7. In each
3 instance, and others, Microsoft has only later published technical disclosures and other
4 information concerning these infringing technologies. Only as technical disclosures and
5 publications concerning these new products and services have become available, InterTrust has
6 been able to identify additional infringements of its patents. An extensive list of these sources,
7 published or released in late 2001 and 2002, is contained in the Declaration of David P. Maher.

8 Similarly, time has not stood still at InterTrust. Pending patent applications have resulted
9 in additional patents being issued to InterTrust, including the '402 patent, issued in May of this
10 year. In its proposed amended complaint, InterTrust alleges infringement of this new patent.
11 Moreover, analysis of material produced by Microsoft in discovery has revealed additional
12 infringed claims from the patents-in-suit.²

13 As a result, it is again necessary for InterTrust to amend both its complaint and its Local
14 Rule 3-1 disclosures, in order to assert all currently known claims in a single action. Those
15 claims include four additional patents. Three of the four additional patents (the '019, 876, and
16 '402 patents) are continuations or divisionals of the same original patent application from which
17 five of the seven patents-in-suit arose. As a result, they share the same inventorship, and
18 substantially the same specification, as the patents already in suit. Thus, there is little or no
19 additional discovery that needs be taken concerning the inventorship of these additional patents:
20 all documents concerning that invention and reduction to practice have already been produced, as
21 well as file histories and draft claim charts. And as Microsoft has not yet deposed any of the
22 inventors or any of the prosecuting attorneys, adding these patents will not result in duplicative
23 discovery. Indeed, Microsoft has to date taken only one deposition of a third party, which will
24 not need to be reconvened as a result of the proposed amendments. The fourth additional patent

25 _____
26 ² Just as with the additional patents, InterTrust on April 30 and again on June 21 served amended
27 claim charts detailing additional claims from the patents-in-suit. Page Decl. ¶ 6 & Exh C.
28 Microsoft has taken the position that InterTrust must seek leave of Court to serve those amended
claim charts. Id., Exhs.E, G. Accordingly, InterTrust asks that the Court, in granting leave to
amend and setting a revised schedule, also grant leave to serve those supplemental claim charts..
See Part II (B), infra.

1 (the '181 patent), although it is not a continuation of other patents-in-suit, springs from the same
2 research efforts at InterTrust, and shares inventorship with the existing patents-in-suit. And
3 again, all documents related to that patent have already been produced, as have file histories and
4 draft claim charts.

5 Similarly, adding the four additional patents will have only limited impact on the conduct
6 of this case under the Local Patent Rules. InterTrust has already produced claim charts for all
7 eleven patents, and Microsoft has not yet served its Patent Local Rule 3-2 invalidity contentions.
8 Although Microsoft will of course be required to present invalidity contentions for eleven patents
9 rather than seven, and the parties and the Court will have to conduct claim construction hearings
10 on eleven patents, the significant overlap of both subject matter and specifications (and thus the
11 significant overlap of terms to be construed) means that Markman proceedings for all eleven
12 patents will be at most only incrementally more complex than proceedings on the existing seven
13 patents: with few if any exceptions, the terms to be construed extend across the entire body of
14 patents. Indeed, given the close relationship between the various InterTrust patents, it would be
15 wildly inefficient to litigate the newer infringements in a separate case, requiring two separate
16 Markman hearings in two separate matters, with near-complete overlap of the terms to be
17 construed.

18 III. ARGUMENT

19 A. LEAVE TO AMEND THE COMPLAINT SHOULD BE GRANTED

20 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 15(a) provides that leave to amend a complaint "shall be
21 freely given when justice so requires." See also Bowles v. Reade, 198 F.3d 752, 757 (9th Cir.
22 1999) (noting that the federal rules evidence a "strong policy permitting amendment"). "Rule
23 15's policy of favoring amendments to pleadings should be applied with extreme liberality."
24 DCD Programs, Ltd. v. Leighton, 833 F.2d 183, 186 (9th Cir. 1987). The Ninth Circuit has noted
25 that, when determining whether to grant leave to amend, a court must evaluate five factors: (1)
26 bad faith by the moving party; (2) undue prejudice to the opposing party; (3) undue delay by the
27 moving party; (4) futility of the amendment; and (5) whether the moving party has previously

28 ///

1 amended its complaint. Id. at 186 & n.3. The party opposing amendment bears the burden of
2 showing prejudice. Id. at 187.

3 Each of these factors militates for leave to amend. There can be no question that
4 InterTrust has acted in good faith: InterTrust could not have included in its initial complaint
5 infringement allegations concerning products and services that had not yet been released (or for
6 which Microsoft had not yet released technical information), or based on patents that had not yet
7 issued. Moreover, InterTrust advised Microsoft many months ago that it expected to add
8 additional infringement allegations based on new information. That issue was discussed at
9 length in the course of preparing the April 1, 2002 Case Management Conference Statement,
10 which expressly sets forth both InterTrust's intention to add additional claims at the agreed-upon
11 time of serving additional Patent Local Rule 3-1 disclosures and the parties' respective positions
12 concerning what effect those additional claims would have on the proposed litigation schedule.
13 Page Decl., ¶¶ 2-5 & Exhs. A & B at 11.³

14 Similarly, leave to amend will not cause any undue prejudice to Microsoft. As noted
15 above, Microsoft has not conducted any depositions of inventors or prosecuting attorneys, so no
16 discovery will need to be repeated. Neither are there any significant rulings that need be
17 revisited, as no claim construction, infringement, or validity issues have yet been decided. Other
18 than document discovery (which, as noted above, has on the InterTrust side covered the proposed
19 additional patents as well as those in suit), this case is despite its age in the early stages of
20 litigation. Admittedly, the allegations of infringement against additional Microsoft products and
21 services expands the scope of the case—and the scope of discovery that must be provided by
22 Microsoft—beyond that of the existing claims. But that is a function of Microsoft's vastly
23 expanded infringement of InterTrust's patents, not of the proposed amendment, and those claims
24 will be brought against Microsoft regardless whether leave is granted to amend this complaint. If

25
26 ³ Due in large part to Microsoft's decision to file its ill-fated summary judgment motion, which it
27 later withdrew, that Case Management Conference was first rescheduled to coincide with the
28 hearing of that motion, and then cancelled along with the withdrawn motion. As a result, the
parties have been proceeding on a proposed litigation schedule that has never been approved by
the Court. InterTrust respectfully urges that a Case Management Conference be held at the
Court's earliest convenience.

1 anything, bringing those additional claims into this case will streamline the overall course of
2 litigation between these parties.

3 Nor can there be a claim that InterTrust has unduly delayed bringing these additional
4 claims. InterTrust has diligently researched new Microsoft products and services as they have
5 been released, and as technical details of their operation have become available. InterTrust has
6 at all times advised Microsoft timely of additional claims, and has even taken the step of
7 providing Microsoft with Local Rule 3-1 claim charts in advance of filing its amended
8 complaint—claim charts that would not actually be due for many months. InterTrust has also
9 diligently brought additional claims into the existing complaint in this action, rather than hold
10 claims back.⁴

11 And finally, there can be no question of futility here: this is not a case where leave to
12 amend is sought in response to a prior dismissal, and thus where the Court can assess whether
13 any proposed amendment could cure a previously-adjudicated defect. Rather, these are new
14 claims, occasioned by additional infringing acts by Microsoft.

15 Conversely, refusal of leave to amend would unduly prejudice InterTrust. Absent leave
16 to amend, InterTrust will be forced to file a separate action, which will begin an entirely new
17 one- to two-year process leading to a largely redundant Markman proceeding. As a result,
18 Microsoft will be able to avoid trial of its current technology almost indefinitely: as that second
19 filing wends its way to trial, Microsoft will undoubtedly continue to release new versions of its
20 software, and continue to resist amendment to encompass its current products. Microsoft will
21 undoubtedly argue that there must be some point at which the pleadings must be fixed, and they
22 are correct in principle. But that time is not now, while discovery is still open, no substantive
23 depositions have been conducted by Microsoft, no substantive rulings have been made, and no
24 invalidity or claims construction positions have been taken. At this early stage, InterTrust
25 submits that the proper and judicially efficient course is to amend the current complaint to

26 ///

27 _____
28 ⁴ As a result, this is InterTrust's Fourth Amended Complaint, but that should not weigh against
InterTrust's amendment here: rather, it is evidence of InterTrust's diligent attempts to avoid

1 encompass all known claims, so that validity and claims construction proceedings can be
2 conducted once rather than multiple times.

3 **B. LEAVE TO SERVE AMENDED PATENT LOCAL RULE 3-1 DISCLOSURES**
4 **SHOULD BE GRANTED**

5 The Court should also grant leave for InterTrust to serve its amended Patent Local Rule
6 3-1 disclosures—amended disclosures that have already been served upon Microsoft on June 21,
7 2002. Patent Local Rule 3-7 provides that preliminary or final infringement contentions may be
8 amended or modified upon a showing of good cause. There can be no dispute that good cause
9 exists for InterTrust to amend its claim charts in this case. The proposed amendments do not
10 change previous infringement positions in order to avoid the effect of prior rulings, as was the
11 case in Atmel Corp. v. Information Storage Devices, 1998 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 17564 (1998)
12 (rejecting attempt to amend claim charts after Markman ruling and with summary judgment
13 motions pending). Rather, they add additional claims of infringement based upon new Microsoft
14 products and services, and based upon documents produced by Microsoft since service of
15 InterTrust's preliminary claims charts. As set forth above and in the Declaration of David P.
16 Maher, the proposed amendments are based in large part on information that was not made
17 available by Microsoft until late last year and this year.

18 Neither can there be any possible prejudice to Microsoft as a result of the amended
19 claims charts. Although InterTrust's prior claim charts were served in November, 2001, nothing
20 of substantive effect has occurred since. Microsoft has not taken any positions in reliance on the
21 prior claim charts: in fact, Microsoft has not yet even served its Patent Local Rule 3-3
22 Preliminary Invalidity Contentions. Under the Patent Local Rules, those disclosures are the next
23 step after Rule 3-1 claim charts, and are supposed to be served 45 days after Rule 3-1
24 disclosures. Microsoft can hardly claim to be prejudiced by amendment of InterTrust's claim
25 charts when it has not even proceeded to the next step in the process. Neither have there been
26 any substantive decisions by the Court in the interim.

27 ///

28 undue delay and prejudice.

Conversely, denial of leave to serve amended claim charts would severely prejudice InterTrust. Denial of leave would mean that Microsoft could avoid liability for significant portions of its ongoing patent infringement simply by releasing new products and services after service of InterTrust's initial disclosures. Unless leave is granted to bring new and newly-discovered infringements into this case, InterTrust would be required to file a separate lawsuit, asserting the same patents against the same defendant, every time Microsoft shipped another infringing product. And, assuming such seriatim complaints were required, Microsoft would upon resolution of the first case surely argue that subsequent cases, filed during the pendency of the first suit, were barred either by res judicata or as impermissibly split causes of action. And of course—as noted above—such seriatim cases would almost certainly be related and consolidated with this case in any event. Where—as here—no prejudice flows from amending the existing claim charts at this early stage, the more logical course is to simply allow the new claims to be amended into the pending litigation. Any other course would be a waste of judicial resources.

IV. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, InterTrust respectfully requests that the Court (1) grant leave to file InterTrust's Fourth Amended Complaint, (2) grant InterTrust leave to serve amended Patent Local Rule 3-1 disclosures, (3) order the consolidated case No. C 02 0647 SBA dismissed as moot, and (4) set a further Case Management Conference at the Court's earliest convenience for the purpose of setting a revised Case Management schedule.

Respectfully submitted:

Dated: July 30, 2002

KEKER & VAN NEST, LLP

By:

MICHAEL H. PAGE
Attorneys for Plaintiff and Counter-
Defendant
INTERTRUST TECHNOLOGIES
CORPORATION

1 KEKER & VAN NEST, LLP
JOHN W. KEKER - #49092
2 HENRY C. BUNSOW - #60707
MICHAEL H. PAGE - #154913
3 710 Sansome Street
San Francisco, CA 94111-1704
4 Telephone: (415) 391-5400
Facsimile: (415) 397-7188

5 INTERTRUST TECHNOLOGIES CORPORATION
6 DOUGLAS K. DERWIN - #111407
MARK SCADINA - #173103
7 JEFF MCDOW - #184727
4800 Patrick Henry Drive
8 Santa Clara, CA 95054
Telephone: (408) 855-0100
9 Facsimile: (408) 855-0144

10 Attorneys for Plaintiff and Counter-Defendant
INTERTRUST TECHNOLOGIES CORPORATION

11
12 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
13 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
14

15 INTERTRUST TECHNOLOGIES
CORPORATION, a Delaware corporation,
16
Plaintiff,

17 v.

18 MICROSOFT CORPORATION, a
19 Washington corporation,
20 Defendant.

21 AND COUNTER ACTION.
22

Case No. C 01-1640 SBA (MEJ)

Consolidated with C 02-0647 SBA

**[PROPOSED] FOURTH AMENDED
COMPLAINT FOR INFRINGEMENT OF
U.S. PATENT NOS. 6,185,683 B1;
6,253,193 B1; 5,920,861; 5,892,900;
5,982,891; 5,917,912; 6,157,721; 5,915,019;
5,949,876; 6,112,181; AND 6,389,402 B1.**

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

23
24 Plaintiff INTERTRUST TECHNOLOGIES CORPORATION (hereafter "InterTrust")
25 hereby complains of Defendant MICROSOFT CORPORATION (hereafter "Microsoft"), and
26 alleges as follows:

27 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

28 1. This action for patent infringement arises under the patent laws of the United

1 States, Title 35, United States Code, more particularly 35 U.S.C. §§ 271 and 281.

2 2. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338(a).

3 3. Venue is proper in this judicial district under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391(c) and 1400(b).

4 **THE PARTIES**

5 4. Plaintiff InterTrust is a Delaware corporation with its principal place of business
6 at 4750 Patrick Henry Drive, Santa Clara, California.

7 5. InterTrust is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Defendant
8 Microsoft is a Washington Corporation with its principal place of business at One Microsoft
9 Way, Redmond, Washington.

10 6. InterTrust is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Defendant
11 Microsoft does business in this judicial district and has committed and is continuing to commit
12 acts of infringement in this judicial district.

13 7. InterTrust is the owner of United States Patent No. 6,185,683 B1, entitled
14 "Trusted and secure techniques, systems and methods for item delivery and execution" ("the
15 '683 patent"), duly and lawfully issued on February 6, 2001.

16 8. InterTrust is the owner of United States Patent No. 6,253,193 B1, entitled
17 "Systems and methods for secure transaction management and electronic rights protection" ("the
18 '193 patent"), duly and lawfully issued on June 26, 2001.

19 9. InterTrust is the owner of United States Patent No. 5,920,861, entitled
20 "Techniques for defining, using and manipulating rights management data structures" ("the '861
21 patent"), duly and lawfully issued on July 6, 1999.

22 10. InterTrust is the owner of United States Patent No. 5,892,900, entitled "Systems
23 and methods for secure transaction management and electronic rights protection" ("the '900
24 patent"), duly and lawfully issued on April 6, 1999.

25 11. InterTrust is the owner of United States Patent No. 5,982,891, entitled "Systems
26 and methods for secure transaction management and electronic rights protection" ("the '891
27 patent"), duly and lawfully issued on November 9, 1999.

28 12. InterTrust is the owner of United States Patent No. 5,917,912 entitled "System

1 and methods for secure transaction management and electronic rights protection" ("the '912
2 patent"), duly and lawfully issued on June 29, 1999.

3 13. InterTrust is the owner of United States Patent No. 6,157,721, entitled "Systems
4 and methods using cryptography to protect secure computing environments" ("the '721 patent"),
5 duly and lawfully issued on December 5, 2000.

6 14. InterTrust is the owner of United States Patent No. 5,915,019, entitled "Systems
7 and methods for secure transaction management and electronic rights protection" (the '019
8 patent"), duly and lawfully issued on June 22, 1999.

9 15. InterTrust is the owner of United States Patent No. 5,949,876, entitled "Systems
10 and methods for secure transaction management and electronic rights protection" ("the '876
11 patent"), duly and lawfully issued on September 7, 1999.

12 16. InterTrust is the owner of United States Patent No. 6,112,181, entitled "Systems
13 and methods for matching, selecting, narrowcasting, and/or classifying based on rights
14 management and/or other information" ("the '181 patent"), duly and lawfully issued on August
15 29, 2000.

16 17. InterTrust is the owner of United States Patent No. 6,389,402 B1, entitled
17 "Systems and methods for secure transaction management and electronic rights protection" ("the
18 '402 patent"), duly and lawfully issued on May 14, 2002.

19 **FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

20 18. InterTrust hereby incorporates by reference paragraphs 1-7 as if restated herein.

21 19. This is a claim for patent infringement under 35 U.S.C. §§ 271 and 281.

22 20. InterTrust is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Microsoft has
23 been and is infringing the '683 patent under § 271(a), as identified in InterTrust's Patent Local
24 Rule 3-1 disclosures served on Microsoft on June 21, 2002. In addition, on information and
25 belief, InterTrust alleges that Microsoft is making and using other systems and/or is in the
26 process of developing other systems, which infringe the '683 patent under § 271(a). InterTrust is
27 further informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Microsoft's infringement of the
28 '683 patent under § 271(a) will continue unless enjoined by this Court.

1 27. InterTrust is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Microsoft has
2 been and is infringing the '193 patent under § 271(a), as identified in InterTrust's Patent Local
3 Rule 3-1 disclosures served on Microsoft on June 21, 2002. In addition, on information and
4 belief, InterTrust alleges that Microsoft is making and using other systems and/or is in the
5 process of developing other systems, which infringe the '193 patent under § 271(a). InterTrust is
6 further informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Microsoft's infringement of the
7 '193 patent under § 271(a) will continue unless enjoined by this Court.

8 28. InterTrust is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Microsoft has
9 been and is knowingly and intentionally inducing others to infringe directly the '193 patent under
10 § 271(a), thereby inducing infringement of the '193 patent under § 271(b). InterTrust is further
11 informed and believes that Microsoft's inducement has at least included the manner in which
12 Microsoft has promoted and marketed use of its software and services identified in InterTrust's
13 Patent Local Rule 3-1 disclosures served on Microsoft on June 21, 2002. InterTrust is further
14 informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Microsoft's infringement of the '193 patent
15 under § 271(b) will continue unless enjoined by this Court.

16 29. InterTrust is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Microsoft has
17 been and is contributorily infringing the '193 patent under § 271(c) by providing software and
18 services especially made or especially adapted for infringing use and not staple articles or
19 commodities of commerce suitable for substantial noninfringing use, including at least the
20 software and services identified in InterTrust's Patent Local Rule 3-1 disclosures served on
21 Microsoft on June 21, 2002. InterTrust is further informed and believes, and on that basis
22 alleges, that Microsoft's infringement of the '193 patent under § 271(c) will continue unless
23 enjoined by this Court.

24 30. InterTrust is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Microsoft is
25 willfully infringing the '193 patent in the manner described above in paragraphs 27 through 29,
26 and will continue to do so unless enjoined by this Court.

27 31. InterTrust is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Microsoft has
28 derived and received, and will continue to derive and receive from the aforesaid acts of

1 infringement gains, profits, and advantages, tangible and intangible, the extent of which are not
2 presently known to InterTrust. By reason of the aforesaid acts of infringement, InterTrust has
3 been, and will continue to be, irreparably harmed.

4 **THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

5 32. InterTrust hereby incorporates by reference paragraphs 1-6 and 9 as if restated
6 herein.

7 33. This is a claim for patent infringement under 35 U.S.C. §§ 271 and 281.

8 34. InterTrust is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Microsoft has
9 been and is infringing the '861 patent under § 271(a), as identified in InterTrust's Patent Local
10 Rule 3-1 disclosures served on Microsoft on June 21, 2002. In addition, on information and
11 belief, InterTrust alleges that Microsoft is making and using other systems and/or is in the
12 process of developing other systems, which infringe the '861 patent under § 271(a). InterTrust is
13 further informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Microsoft's infringement of the
14 '861 patent under § 271(a) will continue unless enjoined by this Court.

15 35. InterTrust is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Microsoft has
16 been and is knowingly and intentionally inducing others to infringe directly the '861 patent under
17 § 271(a), thereby inducing infringement of the '861 patent under § 271(b). InterTrust is further
18 informed and believes that Microsoft's inducement has at least included the manner in which
19 Microsoft has promoted and marketed use of its software and services identified in InterTrust's
20 Patent Local Rule 3-1 disclosures served on Microsoft on June 21, 2002. InterTrust is further
21 informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Microsoft's infringement of the '861 patent
22 under § 271(b) will continue unless enjoined by this Court.

23 36. InterTrust is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Microsoft has
24 been and is contributorily infringing the '861 patent under § 271(c) by providing software and
25 services especially made or especially adapted for infringing use and not staple articles or
26 commodities of commerce suitable for substantial noninfringing use, including at least the
27 software and services identified in InterTrust's Patent Local Rule 3-1 disclosures served on
28 Microsoft on June 21, 2002.. InterTrust is further informed and believes, and on that basis

1 alleges, that Microsoft's infringement of the '861 patent under § 271(c) will continue unless
2 enjoined by this Court.

3 37. InterTrust is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Microsoft is
4 willfully infringing the '861 patent in the manner described above in paragraphs 34 through 36,
5 and will continue to do so unless enjoined by this Court.

6 38. InterTrust is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Microsoft has
7 derived and received, and will continue to derive and receive from the aforesaid acts of
8 infringement gains, profits, and advantages, tangible and intangible, the extent of which are not
9 presently known to InterTrust. By reason of the aforesaid acts of infringement, InterTrust has
10 been, and will continue to be, irreparably harmed.

11 **FOURTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

12 39. InterTrust hereby incorporates by reference paragraphs 1-6 and 10 as if restated
13 herein.

14 40. This is a claim for patent infringement under 35 U.S.C. §§ 271 and 281.

15 41. InterTrust is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Microsoft has
16 been and is infringing the '900 patent under § 271(a), as identified in InterTrust's Patent Local
17 Rule 3-1 disclosures served on Microsoft on June 21, 2002. In addition, on information and
18 belief, InterTrust alleges that Microsoft is making and using other systems and/or is in the
19 process of developing other systems, which infringe the '900 patent under § 271(a). InterTrust is
20 further informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Microsoft's infringement of the
21 '900 patent under § 271(a) will continue unless enjoined by this Court.

22 42. InterTrust is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Microsoft has
23 been and is knowingly and intentionally inducing others to infringe directly the '900 patent under
24 § 271(a), thereby inducing infringement of the '900 patent under § 271(b). InterTrust is further
25 informed and believes that Microsoft's inducement has at least included the manner in which
26 Microsoft has promoted and marketed use of its software and services identified in InterTrust's
27 Patent Local Rule 3-1 disclosures served on Microsoft on June 21, 2002. InterTrust is further
28 informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Microsoft's infringement of the '900 patent

1 under § 271(b) will continue unless enjoined by this Court.

2 43. InterTrust is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Microsoft has
3 been and is contributorily infringing the '900 patent under § 271(c) by providing software and
4 services especially made or especially adapted for infringing use and not staple articles or
5 commodities of commerce suitable for substantial noninfringing use, including at least the
6 software and services identified in InterTrust's Patent Local Rule 3-1 disclosures served on
7 Microsoft on June 21, 2002.. InterTrust is further informed and believes, and on that basis
8 alleges, that Microsoft's infringement of the '900 patent under § 271(c) will continue unless
9 enjoined by this Court.

10 44. InterTrust is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Microsoft is
11 willfully infringing the '900 patent in the manner described above in paragraphs 41 through 43,
12 and will continue to do so unless enjoined by this Court.

13 45. InterTrust is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Microsoft has
14 derived and received, and will continue to derive and receive from the aforesaid acts of
15 infringement gains, profits, and advantages, tangible and intangible, the extent of which are not
16 presently known to InterTrust. By reason of the aforesaid acts of infringement, InterTrust has
17 been, and will continue to be, irreparably harmed.

18 **FIFTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

19 46. InterTrust hereby incorporates by reference paragraphs 1-6 and 11 as if restated
20 herein.

21 47. This is a claim for patent infringement under 35 U.S.C. §§ 271 and 281.

22 48. InterTrust is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Microsoft has
23 been and is infringing the '891 patent under § 271(a), as identified in InterTrust's Patent Local
24 Rule 3-1 disclosures served on Microsoft on June 21, 2002. In addition, on information and
25 belief, InterTrust alleges that Microsoft is making and using other systems and/or is in the
26 process of developing other systems, which infringe the '891 patent under § 271(a). InterTrust is
27 further informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Microsoft's infringement of the
28 '891 patent under § 271(a) will continue unless enjoined by this Court.

49. InterTrust is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Microsoft has been and is knowingly and intentionally inducing others to infringe directly the '891 patent under § 271(a), thereby inducing infringement of the '891 patent under § 271(b). InterTrust is further informed and believes that Microsoft's inducement has at least included the manner in which Microsoft has promoted and marketed use of its software and services identified in InterTrust's Patent Local Rule 3-1 disclosures served on Microsoft on June 21, 2002. InterTrust is further informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Microsoft's infringement of the '891 patent under § 271(b) will continue unless enjoined by this Court.

50. InterTrust is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Microsoft has been and is contributorily infringing the '891 patent under § 271(c) by providing software and services especially made or especially adapted for infringing use and not staple articles or commodities of commerce suitable for substantial noninfringing use, including at least the software and services identified in InterTrust's Patent Local Rule 3-1 disclosures served on Microsoft on June 21, 2002.. InterTrust is further informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Microsoft's infringement of the '891 patent under § 271(c) will continue unless enjoined by this Court.

51. InterTrust is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Microsoft is willfully infringing the '891 patent in the manner described above in paragraphs 48 through 50, and will continue to do so unless enjoined by this Court.

52. InterTrust is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Microsoft has derived and received, and will continue to derive and receive from the aforesaid acts of infringement gains, profits, and advantages, tangible and intangible, the extent of which are not presently known to InterTrust. By reason of the aforesaid acts of infringement, InterTrust has been, and will continue to be, irreparably harmed.

SIXTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

53. InterTrust hereby incorporates by reference paragraphs 1-6 and 12 as if restated herein.

54. This is a claim for patent infringement under 35 U.S.C. §§ 271 and 281.

1 55. InterTrust is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Microsoft has
2 been and is infringing the '912 patent under § 271(a), as identified in InterTrust's Patent Local
3 Rule 3-1 disclosures served on Microsoft on June 21, 2002. In addition, on information and
4 belief, InterTrust alleges that Microsoft is making and using other systems and/or is in the
5 process of developing other systems, which infringe the '912 patent under § 271(a). InterTrust is
6 further informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Microsoft's infringement of the
7 '912 patent under § 271(a) will continue unless enjoined by this Court.

8 56. InterTrust is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Microsoft has
9 been and is knowingly and intentionally inducing others to infringe directly the '912 patent under
10 § 271(a), thereby inducing infringement of the '912 patent under § 271(b). InterTrust is further
11 informed and believes that Microsoft's inducement has at least included the manner in which
12 Microsoft has promoted and marketed use of its software and services identified in InterTrust's
13 Patent Local Rule 3-1 disclosures served on Microsoft on June 21, 2002. InterTrust is further
14 informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Microsoft's infringement of the '912 patent
15 under § 271(b) will continue unless enjoined by this Court.

16 57. InterTrust is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Microsoft has
17 been and is contributorily infringing the '912 patent under § 271(c) by providing software and
18 services especially made or especially adapted for infringing use and not staple articles or
19 commodities of commerce suitable for substantial noninfringing use, including at least the
20 software and services identified in InterTrust's Patent Local Rule 3-1 disclosures served on
21 Microsoft on June 21, 2002. InterTrust is further informed and believes, and on that basis
22 alleges, that Microsoft's infringement of the '912 patent under § 271(c) will continue unless
23 enjoined by this Court.

24 58. InterTrust is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Microsoft is
25 willfully infringing the '912 patent in the manner described above in paragraphs 55 through 57,
26 and will continue to do so unless enjoined by this Court.

27 59. InterTrust is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Microsoft has
28 derived and received, and will continue to derive and receive from the aforesaid acts of

1 infringement gains, profits, and advantages, tangible and intangible, the extent of which are not
2 presently known to InterTrust. By reason of the aforesaid acts of infringement, InterTrust has
3 been, and will continue to be, irreparably harmed.

4 **SEVENTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

5 60. InterTrust hereby incorporates by reference paragraphs 1-6 and 13 as if restated
6 herein.

7 61. This is a claim for patent infringement under 35 U.S.C. §§ 271 and 281.

8 62. InterTrust is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Microsoft has
9 been and is infringing the '721 patent under § 271(a), as identified in InterTrust's Patent Local
10 Rule 3-1 disclosures served on Microsoft on June 21, 2002. In addition, on information and
11 belief, InterTrust alleges that Microsoft is making and using other systems and/or is in the
12 process of developing other systems, which infringe the '721 patent under § 271(a). InterTrust is
13 further informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Microsoft's infringement of the
14 '721 patent under § 271(a) will continue unless enjoined by this Court.

15 63. InterTrust is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Microsoft has
16 been and is knowingly and intentionally inducing others to infringe directly the '721 patent under
17 § 271(a), thereby inducing infringement of the '721 patent under § 271(b). InterTrust is further
18 informed and believes that Microsoft's inducement has at least included the manner in which
19 Microsoft has promoted and marketed use of its software and services identified in InterTrust's
20 Patent Local Rule 3-1 disclosures served on Microsoft on June 21, 2002. InterTrust is further
21 informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Microsoft's infringement of the '721 patent
22 under § 271(b) will continue unless enjoined by this Court.

23 64. InterTrust is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Microsoft has
24 been and is contributorily infringing the '721 patent under § 271(c) by providing software and
25 services especially made or especially adapted for infringing use and not staple articles or
26 commodities of commerce suitable for substantial noninfringing use, including at least the
27 software and services identified in InterTrust's Patent Local Rule 3-1 disclosures served on
28 Microsoft on June 21, 2002.. InterTrust is further informed and believes, and on that basis

1 alleges, that Microsoft's infringement of the '721 patent under § 271(c) will continue unless
2 enjoined by this Court.

3 65. InterTrust is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Microsoft is
4 willfully infringing the '721 patent in the manner described above in paragraphs 62 through 64,
5 and will continue to do so unless enjoined by this Court.

6 66. InterTrust is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Microsoft has
7 derived and received, and will continue to derive and receive from the aforesaid acts of
8 infringement gains, profits, and advantages, tangible and intangible, the extent of which are not
9 presently known to InterTrust. By reason of the aforesaid acts of infringement, InterTrust has
10 been, and will continue to be, irreparably harmed.

11 **EIGHTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

12 67. InterTrust hereby incorporates by reference paragraphs 1-6 and 14 as if restated
13 herein.

14 68. This is a claim for patent infringement under 35 U.S.C. §§ 271 and 281.

15 69. InterTrust is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Microsoft has
16 been and is infringing the '019 patent under § 271(a), as identified in InterTrust's Draft Claim
17 Charts presented to Microsoft on June 21, 2002. In addition, on information and belief,
18 InterTrust alleges that Microsoft is making and using other systems and/or is in the process of
19 developing other systems, which infringe the '019 patent under § 271(a). InterTrust is further
20 informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Microsoft's infringement of the '019 patent
21 under § 271(a) will continue unless enjoined by this Court.

22 70. InterTrust is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Microsoft has
23 been and is knowingly and intentionally inducing others to infringe directly the '019 patent under
24 § 271(a), thereby inducing infringement of the '019 patent under § 271(b). InterTrust is further
25 informed and believes that Microsoft's inducement has at least included the manner in which
26 Microsoft has promoted and marketed use of its software and services identified in InterTrust's
27 Draft Claim Charts presented to Microsoft on June 21, 2002. InterTrust is further informed and
28 believes, and on that basis alleges, that Microsoft's infringement of the '019 patent under §

1 271(b) will continue unless enjoined by this Court.

2 71. InterTrust is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Microsoft has
3 been and is contributorily infringing the '019 patent under § 271(c) by providing software and
4 services especially made or especially adapted for infringing use and not staple articles or
5 commodities of commerce suitable for substantial noninfringing use, including at least the
6 software and services identified in InterTrust's Draft Claim Charts presented to Microsoft on
7 June 21, 2002.. InterTrust is further informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that
8 Microsoft's infringement of the '019 patent under § 271(c) will continue unless enjoined by this
9 Court.

10 72. InterTrust is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Microsoft is
11 willfully infringing the '019 patent in the manner described above in paragraphs 69 through 71,
12 and will continue to do so unless enjoined by this Court.

13 73. InterTrust is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Microsoft has
14 derived and received, and will continue to derive and receive from the aforesaid acts of
15 infringement gains, profits, and advantages, tangible and intangible, the extent of which are not
16 presently known to InterTrust. By reason of the aforesaid acts of infringement, InterTrust has
17 been, and will continue to be, irreparably harmed.

18 **NINTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

19 74. InterTrust hereby incorporates by reference paragraphs 1-6 and 15 as if restated
20 herein.

21 75. This is a claim for patent infringement under 35 U.S.C. §§ 271 and 281.

22 76. InterTrust is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Microsoft has
23 been and is infringing the '876 patent under § 271(a), as identified in InterTrust's Draft Claim
24 Charts presented to Microsoft on June 21, 2002. In addition, on information and belief,
25 InterTrust alleges that Microsoft is making and using other systems and/or is in the process of
26 developing other systems, which infringe the '876 patent under § 271(a). InterTrust is further
27 informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Microsoft's infringement of the '876 patent
28 under § 271(a) will continue unless enjoined by this Court.

77. InterTrust is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Microsoft has been and is knowingly and intentionally inducing others to infringe directly the '876 patent under § 271(a), thereby inducing infringement of the '876 patent under § 271(b). InterTrust is further informed and believes that Microsoft's inducement has at least included the manner in which Microsoft has promoted and marketed use of its software and services identified in InterTrust's Draft Claim Charts presented to Microsoft on June 21, 2002. InterTrust is further informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Microsoft's infringement of the '876 patent under § 271(b) will continue unless enjoined by this Court.

78. InterTrust is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Microsoft has been and is contributorily infringing the '876 patent under § 271(c) by providing software and services especially made or especially adapted for infringing use and not staple articles or commodities of commerce suitable for substantial noninfringing use, including at least the software and services identified in InterTrust's Draft Claim Charts presented to Microsoft on June 21, 2002. InterTrust is further informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Microsoft's infringement of the '876 patent under § 271(c) will continue unless enjoined by this Court.

79. InterTrust is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Microsoft is willfully infringing the '876 patent in the manner described above in paragraphs 76 through 78, and will continue to do so unless enjoined by this Court.

80. InterTrust is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Microsoft has derived and received, and will continue to derive and receive from the aforesaid acts of infringement gains, profits, and advantages, tangible and intangible, the extent of which are not presently known to InterTrust. By reason of the aforesaid acts of infringement, InterTrust has been, and will continue to be, irreparably harmed.

TENTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

81. InterTrust hereby incorporates by reference paragraphs 1-6 and 16 as if restated herein.

82. This is a claim for patent infringement under 35 U.S.C. §§ 271 and 281.

1 83. InterTrust is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Microsoft has
2 been and is infringing the '181 patent under § 271(a), as identified in InterTrust's Draft Claim
3 Charts presented to Microsoft on June 21, 2002. In addition, on information and belief,
4 InterTrust alleges that Microsoft is making and using other systems and/or is in the process of
5 developing other systems, which infringe the '181 patent under § 271(a). InterTrust is further
6 informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Microsoft's infringement of the '181 patent
7 under § 271(a) will continue unless enjoined by this Court.

8 84. InterTrust is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Microsoft has
9 been and is knowingly and intentionally inducing others to infringe directly the '181 patent under
10 § 271(a), thereby inducing infringement of the '181 patent under § 271(b). InterTrust is further
11 informed and believes that Microsoft's inducement has at least included the manner in which
12 Microsoft has promoted and marketed use of its software and services identified in InterTrust's
13 Draft Claim Charts presented to Microsoft on June 21, 2002. InterTrust is further informed and
14 believes, and on that basis alleges, that Microsoft's infringement of the '181 patent under §
15 271(b) will continue unless enjoined by this Court.

16 85. InterTrust is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Microsoft has
17 been and is contributorily infringing the '181 patent under § 271(c) by providing software and
18 services especially made or especially adapted for infringing use and not staple articles or
19 commodities of commerce suitable for substantial noninfringing use, including at least the
20 software and services identified in InterTrust's Draft Claim Charts presented to Microsoft on
21 June 21, 2002. InterTrust is further informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that
22 Microsoft's infringement of the '181 patent under § 271(c) will continue unless enjoined by this
23 Court.

24 86. InterTrust is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Microsoft is
25 willfully infringing the '181 patent in the manner described above in paragraphs 83 through 85,
26 and will continue to do so unless enjoined by this Court.

27 87. InterTrust is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Microsoft has
28 derived and received, and will continue to derive and receive from the aforesaid acts of

1 infringement gains, profits, and advantages, tangible and intangible, the extent of which are not
2 presently known to InterTrust. By reason of the aforesaid acts of infringement, InterTrust has
3 been, and will continue to be, irreparably harmed.

4 **ELEVENTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

5 88. InterTrust hereby incorporates by reference paragraphs 1-6 and 17 as if restated
6 herein.

7 89. This is a claim for patent infringement under 35 U.S.C. §§ 271 and 281.

8 90. InterTrust is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Microsoft has
9 been and is infringing the '402 patent under § 271(a), as identified in InterTrust's Draft Claim
10 Charts presented to Microsoft on June 21, 2002. In addition, on information and belief,
11 InterTrust alleges that Microsoft is making and using other systems and/or is in the process of
12 developing other systems, which infringe the '402 patent under § 271(a). InterTrust is further
13 informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Microsoft's infringement of the '402 patent
14 under § 271(a) will continue unless enjoined by this Court.

15 91. InterTrust is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Microsoft has
16 been and is knowingly and intentionally inducing others to infringe directly the '402 patent under
17 § 271(a), thereby inducing infringement of the '402 patent under § 271(b). InterTrust is further
18 informed and believes that Microsoft's inducement has at least included the manner in which
19 Microsoft has promoted and marketed use of its software and services identified in InterTrust's
20 Draft Claim Charts presented to Microsoft on June 21, 2002. InterTrust is further informed and
21 believes, and on that basis alleges, that Microsoft's infringement of the '402 patent under §
22 271(b) will continue unless enjoined by this Court.

23 92. InterTrust is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Microsoft has
24 been and is contributorily infringing the '402 patent under § 271(c) by providing software and
25 services especially made or especially adapted for infringing use and not staple articles or
26 commodities of commerce suitable for substantial noninfringing use, including at least the
27 software and services identified in InterTrust's Draft Claim Charts presented to Microsoft on
28 June 21, 2002. InterTrust is further informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that

1 Microsoft's infringement of the '402 patent under § 271(c) will continue unless enjoined by this
2 Court.

3 93. InterTrust is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Microsoft is
4 willfully infringing the '402 patent in the manner described above in paragraphs 90 through 92,
5 and will continue to do so unless enjoined by this Court.

6 94. InterTrust is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Microsoft has
7 derived and received, and will continue to derive and receive from the aforesaid acts of
8 infringement gains, profits, and advantages, tangible and intangible, the extent of which are not
9 presently known to InterTrust. By reason of the aforesaid acts of infringement, InterTrust has
10 been, and will continue to be, irreparably harmed.

11 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

12 WHEREFORE, InterTrust prays for relief as follows:

13 A. That Microsoft be adjudged to have infringed the '683 patent under 35 U.S.C. §
14 271(a);

15 B. That Microsoft be adjudged to have infringed the '683 patent under 35 U.S.C. §
16 271(b) by inducing others to infringe directly the '683 patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271(a);

17 C. That Microsoft be adjudged to have contributorily infringed the '683 patent under
18 35 U.S.C. § 271(c);

19 D. That Microsoft be adjudged to have willfully infringed the '683 patent under 35
20 U.S.C. §§ 271(a), (b), and (c);

21 E. That Microsoft, its officers, agents, servants, employees and attorneys, and those
22 persons in active concert or participation with them be preliminarily and permanently restrained
23 and enjoined under 35 U.S.C. § 283 from directly or indirectly infringing the '683 patent;

24 F. That Microsoft be adjudged to have infringed the '193 patent under 35 U.S.C. §
25 271(a);

26 G. That Microsoft be adjudged to have infringed the '193 patent under 35 U.S.C. §
27 271(b) by inducing others to infringe directly the '193 patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271(a);

28 ///

1 H. That Microsoft be adjudged to have contributorily infringed the '193 patent under
2 35 U.S.C. § 271(c);

3 I. That Microsoft be adjudged to have willfully infringed the '193 patent under 35
4 U.S.C. §§ 271(a), (b), and (c);

5 J. That Microsoft, its officers, agents, servants, employees and attorneys, and those
6 persons in active concert or participation with them be preliminarily and permanently restrained
7 and enjoined under 35 U.S.C. § 283 from directly or indirectly infringing the '193 patent;

8 K. That Microsoft be adjudged to have infringed the '861 patent under 35 U.S.C. §
9 271(a);

10 L. That Microsoft be adjudged to have infringed the '861 patent under 35 U.S.C. §
11 271(b) by inducing others to infringe directly the '861 patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271(a);

12 M. That Microsoft be adjudged to have contributorily infringed the '861 patent under
13 35 U.S.C. § 271(c);

14 N. That Microsoft be adjudged to have willfully infringed the '861 patent under 35
15 U.S.C. §§ 271(a), (b), and (c);

16 O. That Microsoft, its officers, agents, servants, employees and attorneys, and those
17 persons in active concert or participation with them be preliminarily and permanently restrained
18 and enjoined under 35 U.S.C. § 283 from directly or indirectly infringing the '861 patent;

19 P. That Microsoft be adjudged to have infringed the '900 patent under 35 U.S.C. §
20 271(a);

21 Q. That Microsoft be adjudged to have infringed the '900 patent under 35 U.S.C. §
22 271(b) by inducing others to infringe directly the '900 patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271(a);

23 R. That Microsoft be adjudged to have contributorily infringed the '900 patent under
24 35 U.S.C. § 271(c);

25 S. That Microsoft be adjudged to have willfully infringed the '900 patent under 35
26 U.S.C. §§ 271(a), (b), and (c);

27 T. That Microsoft, its officers, agents, servants, employees and attorneys, and those
28 persons in active concert or participation with them be preliminarily and permanently restrained

1 and enjoined under 35 U.S.C. § 283 from directly or indirectly infringing the '900 patent;
2 U. That Microsoft be adjudged to have infringed the '891 patent under 35 U.S.C. §
3 271(a);
4 V. That Microsoft be adjudged to have infringed the '891 patent under 35 U.S.C. §
5 271(b) by inducing others to infringe directly the '891 patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271(a);
6 W. That Microsoft be adjudged to have contributorily infringed the '891 patent under
7 35 U.S.C. § 271(c);
8 X. That Microsoft be adjudged to have willfully infringed the '891 patent under 35
9 U.S.C. §§ 271(a), (b), and (c);
10 Y. That Microsoft, its officers, agents, servants, employees and attorneys, and those
11 persons in active concert or participation with them be preliminarily and permanently restrained
12 and enjoined under 35 U.S.C. § 283 from directly or indirectly infringing the '891 patent;
13 Z. That Microsoft be adjudged to have infringed the '912 patent under 35 U.S.C. §
14 271(a);
15 AA. That Microsoft be adjudged to have infringed the '912 patent under 35 U.S.C. §
16 271(b) by inducing others to infringe directly the '912 patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271(a);
17 BB. That Microsoft be adjudged to have contributorily infringed the '912 patent under
18 35 U.S.C. § 271(c);
19 CC. That Microsoft be adjudged to have willfully infringed the '912 patent under 35
20 U.S.C. §§ 271(a), (b), and (c);
21 DD. That Microsoft, its officers, agents, servants, employees and attorneys, and those
22 persons in active concert or participation with them be preliminarily and permanently restrained
23 and enjoined under 35 U.S.C. § 283 from directly or indirectly infringing the '912 patent;
24 EE. That Microsoft be adjudged to have infringed the '721 patent under 35 U.S.C. §
25 271(a);
26 FF. That Microsoft be adjudged to have infringed the '721 patent under 35 U.S.C. §
27 271(b) by inducing others to infringe directly the '721 patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271(a);
28 ///

1 GG. That Microsoft be adjudged to have contributorily infringed the '721 patent under
2 35 U.S.C. § 271(c);

3 HH. That Microsoft be adjudged to have willfully infringed the '721 patent under 35
4 U.S.C. §§ 271(a), (b), and (c);

5 II. That Microsoft, its officers, agents, servants, employees and attorneys, and those
6 persons in active concert or participation with them be preliminarily and permanently restrained
7 and enjoined under 35 U.S.C. § 283 from directly or indirectly infringing the '721 patent;

8 JJ. That Microsoft be adjudged to have infringed the '019 patent under 35 U.S.C. §
9 271(a);

10 KK. That Microsoft be adjudged to have infringed the '019 patent under 35 U.S.C. §
11 271(b) by inducing others to infringe directly the '019 patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271(a);

12 LL. That Microsoft be adjudged to have contributorily infringed the '019 patent under
13 35 U.S.C. § 271(c);

14 MM. That Microsoft be adjudged to have willfully infringed the '019 patent under 35
15 U.S.C. §§ 271(a), (b), and (c);

16 NN. That Microsoft, its officers, agents, servants, employees and attorneys, and those
17 persons in active concert or participation with them be preliminarily and permanently restrained
18 and enjoined under 35 U.S.C. § 283 from directly or indirectly infringing the '019 patent;

19 OO. That Microsoft be adjudged to have infringed the '876 patent under 35 U.S.C. §
20 271(a);

21 PP. That Microsoft be adjudged to have infringed the '876 patent under 35 U.S.C. §
22 271(b) by inducing others to infringe directly the '876 patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271(a);

23 QQ. That Microsoft be adjudged to have contributorily infringed the '876 patent under
24 35 U.S.C. § 271(c);

25 RR. That Microsoft be adjudged to have willfully infringed the '876 patent under 35
26 U.S.C. §§ 271(a), (b), and (c);

27 ///

28 ///

1 SS. That Microsoft, its officers, agents, servants, employees and attorneys, and those
2 persons in active concert or participation with them be preliminarily and permanently restrained
3 and enjoined under 35 U.S.C. § 283 from directly or indirectly infringing the '876 patent;
4 TT. That Microsoft be adjudged to have infringed the '181 patent under 35 U.S.C. §
5 271(a);
6 UU. That Microsoft be adjudged to have infringed the '181 patent under 35 U.S.C. §
7 271(b) by inducing others to infringe directly the '181 patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271(a);
8 VV. That Microsoft be adjudged to have contributorily infringed the '181 patent under
9 35 U.S.C. § 271(c);
10 WW. That Microsoft be adjudged to have willfully infringed the '181 patent under 35
11 U.S.C. §§ 271(a), (b), and (c);
12 XX. That Microsoft, its officers, agents, servants, employees and attorneys, and those
13 persons in active concert or participation with them be preliminarily and permanently restrained
14 and enjoined under 35 U.S.C. § 283 from directly or indirectly infringing the '181 patent;
15 YY. That Microsoft be adjudged to have infringed the '402 patent under 35 U.S.C. §
16 271(a);
17 ZZ. That Microsoft be adjudged to have infringed the '402 patent under 35 U.S.C. §
18 271(b) by inducing others to infringe directly the '402 patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271(a);
19 AAA. That Microsoft be adjudged to have contributorily infringed the '402 patent under
20 35 U.S.C. § 271(c);
21 BBB. That Microsoft be adjudged to have willfully infringed the '402 patent under 35
22 U.S.C. §§ 271(a), (b), and (c);
23 CCC. That Microsoft, its officers, agents, servants, employees and attorneys, and those
24 persons in active concert or participation with them be preliminarily and permanently restrained
25 and enjoined under 35 U.S.C. § 283 from directly or indirectly infringing the '402 patent;
26 DDD. That this Court award damages to compensate InterTrust for Microsoft's
27 infringement, as well as enhanced damages, pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 284;
28 ///

1 EEE. That this Court adjudge this case to be exceptional and award reasonable
2 attorney's fees to InterTrust pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 285;
3 FFF. That this Court assess pre-judgment and post-judgment interest and costs against
4 Microsoft, and award such interest and costs to InterTrust, pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 284; and
5 GGG. That InterTrust have such other and further relief as the Court may deem proper.

6
7 Dated: July __, 2002

KEKER & VAN NEST, LLP

8 By: _____
9 MICHAEL H. PAGE
10 Attorneys for Plaintiff and Counter
11 Defendant
12 INTERTRUST TECHNOLOGIES
13 CORPORATION

14 **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

15 Plaintiff InterTrust herby demands a trial by jury as to all issues triable by jury,
16 specifically including, but not limited to, the issue of infringement of United States Patent Nos.
17 6,185,683 B1; 6,253,193 B1; 5,920,861; 5,892,900; 5,982,891; 5,917, 912; 6,157,721;
18 5,915,019; 5,949,876; 6,112,181; and 6,389,402 B1.

19 Dated: July __, 2002

KEKER & VAN NEST, LLP

20
21 By: _____
22 JOHN W. KEKER
23 Attorneys for Plaintiff and Counter
24 Defendant
25 INTERTRUST TECHNOLOGIES
26 CORPORATION